| | Case 1:25-cv-00251-JLT-SAB Document | 16 Filed 06/12/25 Page 1 of 2 | | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | | | | |
| 9 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | |
| 11 | MIGUEL GARCIA, JR., | Case No. 1:25-cv-0251 JLT SAB (HC) | | | | | |
| 12 | Petitioner, | ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING | | | | | |
| 13 | V. | PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AS AN UNAUTHORIZED SUCCESSIVE PETITION, AND DIRECTING THE CLERK OF COURT TO CLOSE THE | | | | | |
| 14 | C. SCHUYLER, | | | | | | |
| 15 | Respondent. | CASE | | | | | |
| 16 | | (Doc. 12) | | | | | |
| 17 | Miguel Garcia, Jr., is a state prisoner, proceeding with a petition for writ of habeas corpus | | | | | | |
| 18 | pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The magistrate judge performed a preliminary review pursuant to | | | | | | |
| 19 | | Cases and found "the instant petition is 'second or | | | | | |
| 20 | successive' under § 2244(b)" because "Petitioner previously filed a federal habeas petition in this | | | | | | |
| 21 | Court challenging the same conviction, and that petition was denied on the merits." (Doc. 12 at 2, | | | | | | |
| 22 | citing Garcia v. Horel, Case No. 1:07-cv-01105-VRW (E.D. Cal. Nov. 9, 2009).) Because | | | | | | |
| 23 | Petitioner did not obtain leave from the Ninth Circuit to file a successive petition, the magistrate | | | | | | |
| 24 | judge determined this Court lacks jurisdiction. (<i>Id.</i>) Therefore, the magistrate judge | | | | | | |
| 25 | recommended the Court dismiss the petition. (<i>Id.</i>) | | | | | | |
| 26 | The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on Petitioner and notified him that | | | | | | |
| 27 | any objections were due within 30 days. (Doc. 12 at 3.) The Court advised him that the "failure | | | | | | |
| 28 | to file any objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's | | | | | | |
| | | - | | | | | |

| | Case 1:25-cv | v-00251-JLT-SAB | Document 16 | Filed 06/12/25 | Page 2 of 2 | | |
|----|--|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| 1 | order." (Id., citing Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014).) Petitioner did | | | | | | |
| 2 | not file objections, and the time to do so has passed. | | | | | | |
| 3 | According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court performed a de novo review of this case | | | | | | |
| 4 | Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations | | | | | | |
| 5 | are supported by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court ORDERS : | | | | | | |
| 6 | 1. | 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on April 8, 2025 (Doc. 12) are | | | | | |
| 7 | ADOPTED in full. | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2. | The petition for w | rit of habeas corpu | s is DISMISSED w | ithout prejudice. | | |
| 9 | 3. | The Clerk of Cour | t is directed to ente | er judgment and clo | se the case. | | |
| 10 | TT 10 00 0F | | | | | | |
| 11 | IT IS SO OF | RDERED. | | Oani lu | 1 Tan As | | |
| 12 | Dated: | June 12, 2025 | | UNITED STA | L.Tww/m TES DISTRICT JUDGE | | |
| 13 | | | | 3.01.22 3111 | | | |
| 14 | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | | |